

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,416	11/13/2003	Sten R. Gerfast		6809
75	90 08/31/2005		EXAMINER	
STEN R. GERFAST			COZART, JERMIE E	
1802 VALLEY CURVE ROAD MENDOTA HEIGHTS, MN 55118		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MENDOTATIL	2101115, WIIV 33116		3726	

DATE MAILED: 08/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			1
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/706,416	GERFAST, STEN R.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jermie Cozart	3726	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the m earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty triod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT. tatute, cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allo closed in accordance with the practice und	·	•	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	drawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Exan	niner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b) objected to b	y the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	· ·	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control of the oath or declaration is objected to by the	,		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for force a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. Hents have been received in Apporiority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	A) 🔲 lateauta Cu	mman/(PTO 412)	
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 	Paper No(s)	mmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date		ormal Patent Application (PTO-152) -·	

Application/Control Number: 10/706,416

Art Unit: 3726

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The strips are of other material than metal.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 4, 6, and 10 are objected to because of the following informalities: In <u>claim 4</u>, line 1, "then" is objected to because it is the incorrect word being used, it is suggested to change "then" to - -than- -; In <u>claim 6</u>, line 4, "are" is objected to because it is grammatically incorrect and therefore should be deleted, "having" is objected to because it is the incorrect word being used and should be changed to - -have- -; In <u>claim 10</u>, line 2, "then" is objected to because it is the incorrect word being used, it is suggested to change "then" to - -than- -. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In **claim 1**, line 2, it is unclear as to what is meant by the term "both abutments". In claim 7, line 2, it is unclear as to what is meant by the term "both abutments". Appropriate correction is required.

Application/Control Number: 10/706,416

Art Unit: 3726

- 5. Claim 1 recites the limitation "it" in line 3 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- 6. Claim 6 recites the limitation "said keystone shaped slugs" in line 1 of the claim.

 There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- 7. Claim 6 recites the limitation "said rounded corners" in line 2 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- 8. Claim 7 recites the limitation "it" in line 3 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- 9. Claim 12 recites the limitation "said clinching height" in line 1 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 11. Claims 1, 5, 7, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith et al. (2,901,816).

Smith discloses abutting two metal strips (12, 13), punching a substantially rectangular slot (18, 19) into both abutments (i.e. overlapping portions of strips 12, 13), inserting into the two slots a deformable slug/knock-out-slug (14, 15, 16, 17), which is essentially reinserted via deformation back into the center of slot then clinched into the slots, thereby securely joining the strips. A plurality of slots (14, 15, 16, 17) is used.

Art Unit: 3726

The clinching height (fig. 8) is slightly below the surface of the strip. See col. 1, lines 18-20; col. 2, line 34 – col. 4, line 57; and figs. 1-8 for further clarification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 13. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubus (1,141,046).

Regarding <u>claims 1-3, 5, and 6</u>, Dubus discloses abutting (i.e. lean for support on one another) two strips (1, 2) then punching a substantially rectangular slot (figs. 4-6) into both abutments, and inserting into the two slots a deformable slug (3,4; 5,6; 7, 8), and clinching it into the slots, thereby securely joining the strips. The abutments (i.e. overlapping portions of strips 1,2 in fig. 5) are keystone shaped instead of rectangular. The abutments have two rounded edges (fig. 5) inherently produced by a punch (i.e. punching operation carried out, lines 64-65), and it is inherent that a punch is normally used in cooperation with a corresponding die. A plurality of slots (not labeled, figs. 4-6) is used. The keystone shaped slugs (5, 6 in fig. 5) also have rounded corners. See lines 38-100 and figures 1 and 4-6 for further clarification.

Regarding <u>claims 7-9</u> and <u>11</u>, Dubus discloses abutting strips (1, 2), punching a substantially rectangular slot (figs. 4-6) into both abutments, using one knock-out-slug (3,4; 5,6; 7, 8) from the punching, re-inserting the slug into the center of the abutment,

clinching it into the slots thereby securely joining the strips. The slots in both the abutments is keystone shaped (fig. 5) instead of rectangular. The slots in both the abutments have two rounded edges (fig. 5) produced by both a punch (lines 64-65) inherently having a cooperating die. A plurality of slots (not labeled, figs. 4) is used. See lines 38-100 and figures 1 and 4-6 for further clarification.

Dubus does not disclose expressly the strips being metal or material other than metal.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to make the strips of Dubus either metal or material other than metal because Applicant has not disclosed that making the strips of metal or material other than metal provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with strips of Dubus because the strips are effectively joined to one another.

Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Dubus to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1, 4, and 10.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The references cited on the attached PTO-892 are cited to show joining metal sheets to one another.

Application/Control Number: 10/706,416 Page 6

Art Unit: 3726

pm.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jermie Cozart whose telephone number is 571-272-4528. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30 am - 6:00

- 16. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Bryant can be reached on 571-272-4526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.
- 17. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jermie Cozart

Examiner

Art Unit 3726